DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 166 289 UD 018 949

AUTHOR Moore, Barry
TITLE A Study of Child Variance: Volume III, Delivery Systems. The Roots of Counter Institutions. Conceptual Project in Child Variance.
INSTITUTION Michigan Univ., Ann Arbor. Inst. for the Study of Mental Retardation.
SPONS AGENCY Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 73
GRANT OEG-0-71-3680(603)
NOTE 94p.; For related documents, see ED 126 643 and UD 018 948; Not available in hard copy due to author's restriction

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 Plus Postage. HC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *American History; Black History; Collective Settlements; Cultural Factors; *Institutional Role; *Political Influences; Political Socialization; *Revolution; Social Attitudes; *Social Change; *Social Influences
IDENTIFIERS Abolitionists; Bohemianism; Brook Farm; Communes; *Counter Culture; Emerson (Ralph Waldo); New York (New York); Radicalism; Thoreau (Henry David); Transcendentalism

ABSTRACT

Examined in this document are specific political events, values, and styles of cultural revolt which have structured the parameters of rebellion and forged the tradition of outcast life styles. Some of the political events and values dealt with include the history of radicalism in the United States, and the Declaration of Independence, the Constitution, the wave of popular democracy from 1800-1850, the abolitionists, the Industrial Era, the progressives, and the black revolution of the 1960s. Each of these topics is discussed in terms of their historical and/or social perspectives and their influences on political and social change. Emphasized are the conflict of institutions versus individuals and the discrepancy between the theory and practice of democracy. The styles of cultural revolt analyzed in this paper range from the cultural rebellion of the communal movement through the basic philosophies and proponents of transcendentalism, to aspects of the Bohemian movement in New York City. The emphasis in these analyses is on the tension between outsiders and the institutions of social control. An argument is made that this tension has opened pathways of social transformation and preserved the cultural continuity from within. (Author/EB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED166289

DRAFT COPY. NOT FOR REPRODUCTION.

CONCEPTUAL PROJECT IN CHILD VARIANCE

William C. Rhodes, Project Director
Sabin Head, Principal Investigator

A STUDY OF CHILD VARIANCE: VOLUME III, DELIVERY SYSTEMS

THE ROOTS OF COUNTER INSTITUTIONS

by

Barry Moore

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Walter E. Sears
U. of Michigan Press
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

INSTITUTE FOR THE STUDY OF MENTAL RETARDATION AND RELATED DISABILITIES
The University of Michigan
130 South First Street
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48108

UD018949

Editorial Assistant, Judith M. Smith

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to OEG-0-71-3680 (603) Grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Copyright 1973. The University of Michigan. The copyright for this material is claimed only during the period of development, testing, and evaluation, unless authorization is granted by the United States Office of Education to claim copyright also on the final material. For information on the status of the copyright claim, contact either the copyrighting proprietor or the United States Office of Education.

EDITORIAL ASSISTANT, JUDITH M. SMITH

The project presented or reported herein was performed pursuant to OEG-0-71-3680 (603) Grant from the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U. S. Office of Education should be inferred.

Copyright 1973. The University of Michigan.

The copyright for this material is claimed only during the period of development, testing, and evaluation, unless authorization is granted by the United States Office of Education to claim copyright also on the final material. For information on the status of the copyright claim, contact either the copyrighting proprietor or the United States Office of Education.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
HISTORY OF RADICALISM IN THE UNITED STATES	4
The Declaration of Independence	4
The Constitution	5
The Wave of Popular Democracy 1800-1850	8
The Abolitionists	12
The Industrial Era	16
The Progressives	22
The Black Revolution of the 1960's	29
CULTURAL REBELLION	35
The Communal Movement	36
Religious Communes	37
Socialistic Communes	41
Decline of Communes	47
TRANSCENDENTALISM	49
Ralph Waldo Emerson	50
Henry David Thoreau	53
Brook Farm	56
BOHEMIANISM	60
The Village: Pre-World War I	62
The Lost Generation	65
The Beats	72
CONCLUSION	80
REFERENCES	86

INTRODUCTION

During the 1960's, American society was thrown into upheaval by a series of internal protests and new ideologies. The assumed stability of national institutions was at first challenged by minority groups and a middle class elite of radicals. By the decade's end the discontent had spread to a much larger group of people who were united by their opposition to many of the national institutions.

It was this spectrum of disaffiliation that gave impetus to the rise of the counter culture, a nation within a nation, that embraced new life styles and political programs for societal reform. The counter culture offered an escape from the ensnarement of social control by institutions by proclaiming new values that affirmed personal liberation and a reinvigorated sense of community as answers to social repression. Yet espousing the ideal of a new culture was not the same as building a new culture. If the counter culture was to be a viable means of social change, it would need new social forms to care for its members. Thus, the latter part of the 1960's witnessed the growth of a series of counter institutions that attempted to bridge the gap between human need and personal independence.

It may seem somewhat of an anomaly that an anti-institutional movement has its own institutions. Granted that the word presents semantic difficulties, the process which it describes is clear. A counter institution recognizes that people have certain needs, such

as health care, a sense of community, and education, which must be attended to by social groups. What makes counter institutions unique is that they reject the dominant culture's authority and its techniques for providing for those needs. The counter culture erects, in the place of institutions, small groups that cater to those needs in personal, non-authoritarian types of interactions. Movements such as free schools, radical therapy groups, or communes are attempts at returning people to a sense of self and community in a less structured and de-institutionalized setting.

It is our contention that the contemporary revolt against institutionalized conformity and alienation is part of continuous tradition in American society. Current styles of radicalism did not emerge from thin air, but have many historical precedents. When a campus rebel proclaims, "I am a human being. Do not spin, fold, or mutilate me," his protest against technology is part of a tradition that has, in the past, fought against an economic system that turns the individual into property. When a commune expounds the virtues of nature over civilization, it reflects the heritage of agrarian utopians. Contemporary counter institutions thus find their roots in styles and ideologies of radical behavior that have been part of this culture for two hundred years.

However, contemporary counter institutions are not only the culmination of an historic process of radicalism, but they are unique in themselves. One can establish historical precedents but they do not describe the precise alchemy of their creation. The

contemporary counter culture has many diverse trends of revolt which overlap each other. As Theodore Roszak has noted, the counter culture is a fusion of political and cultural radicalism (Roszak, 1969, p.49). This type of fusion creates confusion when we attempt to draw clean lines of influence from the past. Specific modes of revolt in the past which are clearly distinguishable as political or Bohemian rebellion are juxtaposed when we enter present times.

Because of these tangled lines of influence, it is difficult to present an evolutionary development of radicalism from past to present in tidy sequence. Our purpose is to examine specific episodes and values from the national history which can inductively suggest historical affinities with the contemporary counter institutions. This essay is not purely a "dates and facts" form of historiography. Our concern is with the ideas and values that have been transmitted to contemporary dissenters.

The first section of the paper is devoted to those political events and values which have structured the parameters of rebellion. Its major themes are the conflict of institutions versus individuals, and the discrepancy between the theory and practice of democracy. In the second part, we will analyze the styles of cultural revolt, from communes to Greenwich Village, which have forged the tradition of the outcast life styles.

HISTORY OF RADICALISM IN THE UNITED STATES

The Declaration of Independence

Political radicalism can be called the raison d'être of the United States. Without that, the spark of rebellion, the revolution of 1776-1782 could not have occurred. The revolutionaries accepted the distinction of natural law that the right of government rests upon the consent of the governed. Whenever the government does not operate with this consent, the people become tyrannized by a usurpation of power. It was upon this reasoning that the revolutionaries based their secession from the rule of George III.

The nucleus of this position can be found in the Declaration of Independence. Authored by Jefferson, the Declaration stated that people had certain natural rights, such as life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that were inherent in man even before he entered into a social contract of government. A violation of any of these rights by arbitrary government justified the right of rebellion as a redress to tyranny.

While the Declaration was rhetoric, never embodied as law, its importance for expressing the ideals of democracy cannot be underestimated. Its principles were not only a creed for establishing social relations, but it helped to push the principles of revolution into the channels of political institutions. It was a moral bond of national unity shared by all people, and this consensus aided the social revolution in the wake of political revolution.

The Declaration represented an ideal of democracy that would form a basic dynamic in cultural change. It established a tension between the ideal of political equality and the actuality of inequality. This discrepancy between the promise of the Revolution and the realities of implementing the new freedom would prove to be a major factor in future radical change. One test of democracy would be the calculus of the Declaration. Since radicalism involves the search for the roots of social oppression and liberation, the Declaration became a major basis for American dissent, particularly as regards the injustice of social institutions. As Staughton Lynd (1969, p.10) has noted:

> The language of the Declaration of Independence remains relevant as an instrument for social transformation. What pre-Civil War radicals meant by these old words has much in common with what the modern radical movement means... Men should be free, according to the revolutionary tradition, because on joining society they do not surrender their essential natural powers. If existing society abuses those powers, men should demand their restoration at once...

It is this tension between revolutionary freedom and institutionalized liberty that provided future social conflicts, such as the Civil War and the counter culture, with a common source of rhetoric.

The Constitution

Reconciling the issue of the Declaration's liberty of the individual and the need to control that freedom through institutions resulted in a critical discrepancy when the Constitution was written. After five years of what some viewed as social turmoil and economic

instability following the revolution, the Constitutional Convention was convened in 1787 to control the fervor of freedom. While the revolution had been made by an alliance of the masses and a propertied elite, the members of the Convention were largely upper-class men of property. None of the revolutionary, firebrand radicals were present (Lens, 1966, p.47). The representatives, elitist-oriented, were suspicious of the dangers of excessive popular democracy and of the ability of the people to govern themselves. There was also an economic concern in their fear of the levelling effects of democracy. The large owners of property felt that their stake in government was larger and more powerful than that of unpropertied individuals. The equalizing tendency of democracy would result in the loss of their privilege. Factions would arise due to the inequality of economic distribution which could become an overbearing majority working against the propertied minority. Because of these fears, the Constitution that was formulated severely limited local revolutionary democracy and protected national interests and economic rights (Beard, 1941, pp.154-161).

The result was a conservative document which secured some of the rights of the Declaration, while erecting a series of channelling devices to protect against the predicted excesses of democracy. There was a serious schism between the interests of the few and the democratic impulses of the masses. An elite had formulated the nature of political democracy with the ingrained

confusion of "affirming personal liberty while at the same time linking it to private property and economic self interest (Lynd, 1969, p.11)."

What emerged was perhaps the most basic ambiguity for the future of American democracy: the sanctity of personal property was placed on an equal level with the rights of personal liberty. This equation of economic and political liberty would create a schism in the fabric of supposedly democratic social institutions, for it meant that the interests of the few could have equal voice with the interest of the many. By this exaltation of economic individualism the few had been given legal rights that could exceed the powers of political institutions to control. This equation of personal gain with democratic liberty would ultimately lead to social conflict. The Civil War would be fought over this nebulous definition. The right of slaveholders to use people as property conflicted with the slaves' right to equality. In the Industrial Era the extension of this freedom of economic individualism would raise a few millionaires to the power of controlling not only economics but government itself. Ruthless and anarchic self-interest was inadequately regulated, due to the fundamental ambiguity of the Constitution on this issue.

Today the same questions are raised; the economic interest is called technocracy, and its economic control over personal liberty reflects this basic contradiction in the nebulous constitutional doctrine. In this confusion we find a basic influence upon the

growth of a radical consciousness, for the radical would challenge the interests of an elite in the name of what he believes to be the popular interest. The force of social dissent would be a major factor in challenging the steady increase in the influence of vested, propertied interests.

The Wave of Popular Democracy 1800-1850

In the early period of the Republic, possible ideological contradictions were quickly smothered by a wave of patriotic nationalism. The exuberance of the nation swelled into a popular explosion that elected Jefferson in 1800. His victory was viewed as the triumph of democracy over the interests of a propertied elite represented by people like John Adams and Alexander Hamilton.

Jefferson's presidency carried with it an explicit anti-institutional bias. Jefferson had supported the idea that the best government was that which governed least. He believed that government's sole function was to promote happiness and personal liberty. These ideas culminated in the popular idealization of the common farmer. The agrarian myth succeeded in tying together the revolutionary spirit, a cult of nature, and a cult of the individual. America was an unblemished Eden that started with perfection and ended in freedom. To preserve this utopian state of wilderness, the independent farmer became the keystone. He was an Adam who nurtured democratic individualism and self-determination.

The decentralized liberty of the land thus became the ideal that symbolized this early wave of radically individualistic popular democracy (Smith, 1970, p.125).

Yet, the agrarian myth led to a serious paradox. While it was a unifying national ideology, its premises were based upon disunity and anarchic individualism. The farm was free from society and the yeoman was his own man. The celebration of the American wilderness as Eden was the avowal of savagery as civilization. This implied a significant Janus-like condition of the American mind. The impetus of the Revolution had been to create an expectation of unbridled liberty and limitless individualism. Yet these notions of freedom were soon at odds with the reality of the increasingly cohesive, nationalistic and centralized state of society. The demands of society were not always the same as those of the individual. The agrarian myth, widely accepted as a social doctrine and political rhetoric, pinpointed the basic schism between the aims of personal liberty and the designs of political institutions of control.

The dilemma emerged more clearly during Andrew Jackson's administration. The Jeffersonian myth of an agrarian utopia became fused with the Jacksonian cult of the common man (Hofstadter, 1955, p.28). Now government was in the hands of the true democrat, the common man, and it worked for the defeat of any aristocratic interest, as evidenced by Jackson's veto of the National Bank. During the 1830-1850's, this mood of popular

democracy spurred a series of humanitarian crusades and institutions which spread the optimism and perfectionism of the democratic faith. The common school movement began. The prison system was reformed and more humane treatment toward the prisoners was practiced. Increased facilities, such as Samuel Howe's school for the deaf, were made available to the wards of the state. In this furor and faith in the power of democratic perfectionism, the very institutions of society were radically democratic. A large segment of society was swept with a fervor for reform which the openness and fluidity of the institutions could contain.

Yet this process also involved the fusion of patriotic ideology with the institutions of society. Democracy was shifting its emphasis from Arcadia to institutions. The public school movement quickly became allied with democratic nationalism (Tyler, 1962, p.24). It was argued that a strong democracy would need educated citizens. Public education would insure the strength of national institutions by creating educated people who could preserve the tradition of equality. Education for all meant democracy for all. The Temperance crusade in this period also emphasized a similar rhetoric. The drunk promoted the dissolution of the democratic community, while the sober person strengthened society by his resolute and responsible behavior (Curti, 1946, p.108). This incorporation of egalitarian and democratic principles into the social institutions was evidence of the growing consolidation of the previously radically egalitarian

society. Loyalty to the principles of democracy presupposed loyalty to its institutions.

This process of institutionalization carried with it the possibility of the loss of personal freedom. The revolutionary tradition of equality and liberty was transformed into a mass sentiment of freedom which suggested the danger that: "...America is essentially a one dimensional society with a single basic life style, a single character type. Equality of condition American style defines a common social situation and enforces a common pattern of response (Meyers, 1957, p.49)." Thus, the original aims of egalitarian individualism had been metamorphosed into a conformist condition which compromised that same individualism.

If we are to trace the growth of radical consciousness in this society, we can see its beginnings in this fundamental tension between institutional liberty and personal liberty. The democratic wave of radicalism had been absorbed by a society which proclaimed itself devoted to social welfare and personal freedom. Yet, by the institutionalization of democratic principles, it had often cut short the pluralism necessary to sustain a creative democracy. Equality became monolithic in its institutionalized translation. To realize the radical conditions of revolutionary freedom, and to fulfill personal idealism, the individual now was forced to go outside the established social order.

Ironically, society had erected a double bind based on the contradiction between institutional individualism and personal freedom. To gain personal liberty in the midst of monolithic equality, a person might have to withdraw from the social mechanism. Yet such an action would be viewed as disloyal, unpatriotic, and anti-democratic. The institutions protected democracy, why should anyone rebel from them?

The social dissenter found himself in a curious situation. His vision of democracy was based upon an appeal to the revolutionary tradition that was now in the past tense. To invoke the radicalism of the Declaration or even the vision of agrarian Eden could make the radical democrat appear as an outsider, a threat to the ongoing norms of society. Although these people were motivated by purest impulses of democratic politics, their vision became a threat to social order. The Revolution had been fufilled and now was in the process of protecting its orthodoxy from any challenge. In short, yesterday's revolution becomes today's orthodoxy.

The Abolitionists

The movement to abolish slavery illustrates the issues we have already described. The conflict of property versus liberty and the conflict of individualism versus institutionalism spawned a crisis, finally plunging the nation into civil war. The national institutions did not contain the means to abolish slavery; indeed, the institutions were supportive of it. The foundation of democracy--equality--could not be extended to the slaves by the institutions.

In this crisis, the institutions were unable to function. Social control was weakened. Churches became divided over the abolition question. The House of Representatives refused to consider the flood of anti-slavery petitions sent to it. The power of popular democracy could not be controlled by its institutions and, as a result of the demands put upon them, they grew weaker. As Stanley M. Elkins (1959, p.177) notes:

> [T]he democratization of all the major institutions once familiar to American life had to a profound degree worked to undermine the same institutions, and that in a larger sense such institutional breakdown was the very condition or price of national success.

In this vacuum created by loss of institutional control, the logical alternative, given America's historical evolution, was the radically democratic proclamation of individualism.

The abolitionists took the question of slavery beyond the control of democratic institutions to the realm of morality. They denounced a society that mouthed equality while allowing slavery to exist. When the abolitionists invoked the egalitarianism of the Revolution, or the right of free speech and conscience in the Constitution, they encountered suppression. They faced imprisonment, mob violence and even death when they proclaimed the freedom of equality. Their literature was banned in the South (Tyler, 1962, p.486). They were un-American in the context of the 1830's. The vehemence of southern opposition and northern indifference pushed the abolitionists out of the institutional framework.

They could no longer support their claims in an institutional context. They invoked a higher law--personal conscience--to counteract the failure of democratic institutions (Elkins, 1959, p.27). Their traditional expectations from the system were unfulfilled, so they went beyond the system and posed the question of equality as an issue of guilt and morality. Henry Thoreau declared (Thoreau, 1950, pp.636-637):

> Must the citizen ever for a moment, or in the least degree, resign his conscience to the legislator? Why has every man a conscience, then? I think that we should be men first, and subjects afterward. It is not desirable to cultivate a respect for the law, so much as for right.

The conclusions reached by the abolitionists reflected their ties with the revolutionary tradition. They argued that a state which does not permit liberty must be dissolved. An inability to redress the problem of inequality suggested the illegitimacy of social controls. This caused many abolitionists to refuse to give their loyalty to the state and to proclaim themselves citizens of the world (Lynd, 1969, p.132). In 1836, William Lloyd Garrison renounced his allegiance to the country and nominated Jesus Christ for the presidency of the United States and the world. Once they had forsaken their loyalty to the government, it was easy to move to an extreme position which denied the legitimacy of laws which challenged their personal morality. Thus, Thoreau refused to pay his poll tax; the underground railroad illegally transported slaves to free states; John Brown executed Kansas slaveholders.

The irony of the situation was that as the response to slavery became less institutionalized, the abolitionist sentiments became more widely shared and democratically approved (Elkins, 1959, p.185), for aside from the moral issues associated with slavery, there was the economic threat represented by Southern slaveholders. They represented an aristocratic elite that existed by the labor of slavery. There was a widespread fear by Northern laborers that if the system of slavery were not crushed, it could be extended as a capitalistic principle throughout the nation. The result that the Northerners feared was a conspiratorial coalition between the slaveholder and the Northern industrialist that would subvert the freedom of white men and degrade the value of free labor. Although derived from conspiratory extensions, this argument nevertheless recognized the fundamental fact that democratic institutions had not offered adequate protection of personal liberty from the excesses of an aggressive aristocracy. Once this question was identified with the political parties and the extension of slavery into the territories, the civil conflict was "irrepressible."

The importance of the abolitionists rests upon their methods of revolt. Once they had rejected the gradualism of institutional reform of slavery, they turned to a critique of the system based upon moral conscience and freedom of expression. Since, as Meyers suggested, American society in the 1840's and 1850's was becoming increasingly one-dimensional, the abolitionists'

appeal to a radical egalitarianism and to the conscience of the individual was an anachronism that only furthered their alienation from the community. In their intense drive for liberation of the slave and for the right of individual dissent, the abolitionists created a counter-community based upon the free expression of radical egalitarianism and individualism. Two visions of democracy were in conflict in the antebellum period--the institutional and the individualistic. It was in this tension between freedom of self and community control of freedom that the radical conscience was forged.

The Industrial Era

After the Civil War, a new force of change swept the land, creating many of the problems that remain unanswered today. The old America of small cities, isolated farms and individual enterprise was giving way to a feverish drive toward centralization and national consolidation. This growing concentration of political and economic power completely upset the stability of the social order. In its wake, the period of 1865-1900 produced an age of greed and suffering unmatched in national history.

At the crux of this crisis was the inability of social institutions to control the effects of industrial capitalism. Economic rights were given precedence over human rights. Powerful capitalists, such as Rockefeller, J. P. Morgan or Vanderbilt, usurped democratic government and used it for their own ends (Reich, 1970, p.33-34). Through their representatives in

The irony of the situation was that as the response to slavery became less institutionalized, the abolitionist sentiments became more widely shared and democratically approved (Elkins, 1959, p.185), for aside from the moral issues associated with slavery, there was the economic threat represented by Southern slaveholders. They represented an aristocratic elite that existed by the labor of slavery. There was a widespread fear by Northern laborers that if the system of slavery were not crushed, it could be extended as a capitalistic principle throughout the nation. The result that the Northerners feared was a conspiratorial coalition between the slaveholder and the Northern industrialist that would subvert the freedom of white men and degrade the value of free labor. Although derived from conspiratory extensions, this argument nevertheless recognized the fundamental fact that democratic institutions had not offered adequate protection of personal liberty from the excesses of an aggressive aristocracy. Once this question was identified with the political parties and the extension of slavery into the territories, the civil conflict was "irrepressible."

The importance of the abolitionists rests upon their methods of revolt. Once they had rejected the gradualism of institutional reform of slavery, they turned to a critique of the system based upon moral conscience and freedom of expression. Since, as Meyers suggested, American society in the 1840's and 1850's was becoming increasingly one-dimensional, the abolitionists'

appeal to a radical egalitarianism and to the conscience of the individual was an anachronism that only furthered their alienation from the community. In their intense drive for liberation of the slave and for the right of individual dissent, the abolitionists created a counter-community based upon the free expression of radical egalitarianism and individualism. Two visions of democracy were in conflict in the antebellum period--the institutional and the individualistic. It was in this tension between freedom of self and community control of freedom that the radical conscience was forged.

The Industrial Era

After the Civil War, a new force of change swept the land, creating many of the problems that remain unanswered today. The old America of small cities, isolated farms and individual enterprise was giving way to a feverish drive toward centralization and national consolidation. This growing concentration of political and economic power completely upset the stability of the social order. In its wake, the period of 1865-1900 produced an age of greed and suffering unmatched in national history.

At the crux of this crisis was the inability of social institutions to control the effects of industrial capitalism. Economic rights were given precedence over human rights. Powerful capitalists, such as Rockefeller, J. P. Morgan or Vanderbilt, usurped democratic government and used it for their own ends (Reich, 1970, p.33-34). Through their representatives in

Congress, they were able to exert undue influence upon government. A representative came to represent not the interests of the people, but of the corporations. The government was unable or unwilling to compete with the powers of capitalism. In 1894, when a gold crisis drained the reserves of the treasury, the government was forced to borrow from J. P. Morgan's private firm in order to maintain currency stability. A private monied interest had thus salvaged the integrity of the United States government.

The breakdown of national control extended to other institutions. After the Civil War, Congress passed the Fourteenth Amendment which guaranteed the rights of ex-slaves by forbidding a state to "deprive any person of life, liberty or property without due process of law." In 1886, the Supreme Court extended this doctrine to corporations, in effect voiding many states' laws that regulated corporations, on the grounds that they deprived the corporations of their property 'without due process." This meant that the corporation was now a "person" and had rights equal to those of a citizen. The initial ambiguity at the Constitutional Convention between economic and personal freedom became a reality. Property now had the sanctity of citizenship.

Speaking only in institutional terms obscures the human suffering of the period. Children worked up to twelve hours a day, seven days a week, in factories. By 1888, industrial "accidents" were killing workers at the rate of 100 per day. In 1873 and 1893, economic manipulation by the powerful industrialists

and bankers had thrown the country into depression. Millions were unemployed; starvation and suicide were common. There were no adequate institutions to control this social imbalance. The emerging situation was analogous to the pre-Civil War period, only the new slaves were legally free, but had no voice in the conditions of their freedom. It is in this cycle of institutional breakdown that the radical was awakened. Just as in the antebellum period, once the institutions of control became powerless, community was ripped apart. A state of neo-anarchy reigned in the Industrial Era, where the political process and economic process had drifted away from any form of democratic order. In this vacuum of social control and atomsphere of liberal individualism, a radical vision of democracy appeared as a basic redress to a growing feudal and aristocratic system.

The farmers of the Midwest and South were among the first to take popular action against the industrial-political octopus. During the post-Civil War period, the farmers were the victims of rising costs and falling prices. Drought and eroded soil increased their miseries and caused evictions of many families. Agriculture, which represented one-half the national wealth in 1860, accounted for only one-fifth of the total 50 years later. The independence of the farmer was seriously compromised in the throes of this depression. Absentee ownership of farms by eastern mortgage and insurance firms became prevalent.

To combat this destruction, farmers in the Midwest organized the National Grange of the Patrons of Husbandry in the 1870's. The Grange began organizing a series of ventures in cooperative purchasing to bring down the high prices of goods. They formed cooperative stores, shared grain elevators and purchased mass quantities of farm tools at wholesale prices (Wasserman, 1972, pp.66-68). The Grange also pushed for political reform. During the depression of the middle 1870's, Grange party representatives were powerful blocs in Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota and Wisconsin. They were able to pass legislation to regulate the corrupt railroad freight schedules.

But by the end of the decade, the Grange could not sustain itself. Its primitive attempts at collectivism had failed internally and it could not withstand the monied powers. The railroads ignored the laws for fair rates and the politicians were loath to provide adequate enforcement. The cooperative movement met equal resistance. Banks refused the stores' credit, manufacturers raised prices on wholesale goods and the railroads refused to carry farm products. Faced with these overwhelming pressures, the Grange movement collapsed by 1880.

In 1875, a new organization developed in Texas that was destined to take the place of the Grange. The Farmer's Alliance originally formed to fight infringement of property rights by the cattle barons. But it soon found itself involved in collective purchasing arrangements and cooperatives. As more

and more farmers were evicted from their lands and farm prices fell, the membership in the Alliance increased. Rapidly its organization filtered into the Midwest and took the place of the defunct Grange (Wasserman, 1972, p.70). Since many of the Alliance's programs embraced legislative reform, such as the regulation of the railroads and the prohibition of absentee land ownership, it was political in a more vigorous way than the Grange. By 1890, Alliance candidates had captured mayoralty elections and many state legislatures.

Yet local action was insufficient. The farmers' organizations recognized that they were dealing with a national problem. In 1892, the Alliance members and militant urban workers met in Omaha, Nebraska, to form a national political party. The political platform that emerged was the most radical third party statement in national history. In their preamble they declared (Pollack, 1967, p.60):

> The conditions which surround us best justify our cooperation: we meet in the midst of a nation brought to the verge of moral, political, and material ruin. Corruption dominates the ballot-box, the legislatures, the Congress, and touches even the ermine of the bench. The people are demoralized; most of the States have been compelled to isolate the voters at the polling-places to prevent universal intimidation or bribery. The newspapers are largely subsidized or muzzled; public opinion silenced; business prostrated; our homes covered with mortgages; labor impoverished; and the land concentrating in the hands of the capitalists. The urban workmen are denied the right of organization for self-protection; imported pauperized labor

> beats down their wages; a hireling standing army, unrecognized by our laws, is established to shoot them down, and they are rapidly degenerating into European conditions. The fruits of the toil of millions are boldly stolen to build up colossal fortunes for a few, unprecedented in the history of mankind; and the possessors of these, in turn, despise the republic and endanger liberty. From the same prolific womb of governmental injustice we breed the two great classes--tramps and millionaires.

The Populists' platform offered a widespread critique of national institutions. They called for: 1) government ownership of the railroads, telegraph and telephone; 2) the adoption of the secret ballot; 3) the 8-hour work day; 4) a graduated income tax and 5) the free coinage of silver. Yet, the purpose of these programs, however advanced they appeared, was aimed at the restoration of the traditional values and institutions which had been usurped by monopoly.

The Populists' object was to reassert popular democracy in order to strengthen competitive capitalism and to save small enterprise (Destler, 1963, p.20). For them, the utopia of the republic could be restored if society would follow the Jeffersonian and Jacksonian maxim--"equal rights to all, special privileges to none (Pollack, 1967, xii)." They appealed, in the now familiar Janus posture of American radicalism, to the ideals of the past to structure the social system of the future.

But political power was denied. The Populist candidate for president, James Weaver, was defeated in 1892. The Depression

of 1893 kept agitation and unrest high and Populist membership continued to increase. In 1896, after a stormy convention, the Populists decided to throw their support to the Democratic party candidate, William Jennings Bryan. Amidst cries of widespread voting fraud and the threat of some industrialists to lay off their men if Bryan won, McKinley carried the Northern states and won. The defeat was fatal to the Populists. The members drifted apart and by 1898 the movement was dead.

The Progressives

The demise of the Populists did not signify the end of reform. The Progressive movement arose from the middle-class concern for opportunity and from a demand for democratic control of the corporations and government. Progressivism inaugurated a new form of institutional reform, which diluted many radical proposals and then channelled them through the systems of power. The Progressives, as good middle-class Americans, were not out to overthrow the system but they wanted to control its most glaring evils. As a philosophy of reform, Progressivism was to create lasting reverberations in the political system that would determine many institutional responses to change down to the 1960's.

Progressivism was both a social ideology and a political program. In its early period, it is best seen as a cynical consciousness of social evils. Muckrakers, like Lincoln Steffens

and Ida Tarbell, inaugurated a scathing self-examination of municipal corruption and the evils of monopoly, in the period from 1900-1912.

Through McClure's Magazine, the muckrakers spread information about social corruption to an urban, middle-class audience. And people began to listen to their cries for reform. A process familiar to the abolitionists was repeating itself--radical propaganda was reaching the minds of the average person and awakening their sense of social responsibility (Weinberg, 1961, p.xix).

This process ultimately found political outlets. The presidency of Theodore Roosevelt from 1901-1908 inaugurated the institutionalization of some of the programs for reform. In 1902, he started an anti-trust suit against J. P. Morgan's holding company, Northern Securities, which threatened to monopolize national transportation. Roosevelt's victory in the suit pressed him to more widespread reform. In 1903, he established the Department of Commerce and Labor to deal with the glaring evils of industrialism. He later pressed suits against the Beef Trust and the Sugar Trust, and controlled the railroads more thoroughly by the Hepburn Act. In 1906, Congress passed the Pure Food & Drugs Act to offer the consumer protection from the filth that was put in meat products.

It is important to note that while Roosevelt may have been called a "trust-buster" and Progressive, his reforms did not seriously disturb the capitalistic control of society. Northern Securities simply evaded the anti-trust decision by issuing two sets of stock. Facing a depression in 1907, Roosevelt permitted United States Steel to buy one of its competitors to strengthen its monopolistic hold on finances. Thus, the political institutions allowed the basic system to continue, while adjusting the most obvious inequalities in the corporate structure. As Hofstadter noted of the movement, "Successful resistance to reform required a partial incorporation of the reform program (Hofstadter, 1955, p.132)." What Roosevelt did was to start an alliance between business and government, in which the state now shared in the decision-making powers with the corporation. This mode of reform increased the power of social institutions to affect change, but it did so by compromising the original radical critique embodied in them.

The second danger in the Progressive movement arose from its ideology of social action. Whether it was Hull House, or Dewey's experimental school, or Roosevelt's controlling the trust, there was the optimistic belief that institutions could funnel discontent and create change. The institutional breakdown during the early industrial period had been stopped; sheer Darwinistic power and economic aggression had been subdued by

the reassertion of social controls. But Progressive reform carried with it the threat of a new institutional power. Jane Addams could in one breath celebrate the robust energies of youth, while in the next talk of how such energy could be controlled by clubs and Americanization programs. When Dewey's experimental approach to education was absorbed in the mainstream of culture, it promoted conformity, not individualism. Christopher Lasch (1967, p.146) has highlighted this inconsistency in Progressivism:

> Totalitarianism was hardly the goal toward which American progressives were even consciously striving. But the manipulative note was rarely absent from their writings: the insistence that men could best be controlled and directed not by the old, crude method of force but by "education" in its broadest sense. The good of the individual was sacrificed to the interests of the State.

These two qualities of Progressivism--control and corporate alliance--culminated in the New Deal reforms of Franklin D. Roosevelt. For Roosevelt preserved the system of private enterprise that created the Depression, but he radically altered the relationship of government to the economy and society. In this process, the institutions gained more and more control over private lives, to the point where the Roosevelt revolution fundamentally altered the nature of personal initiative and freedom. It is from this institutional gargantua that the dialectic of the current counter-institutional revolt would emerge.

America of the 1930's was not on the verge of revolution, but it was a vastly disillusioned and disturbed country that demanded swift measures to prevent the collapse of confidence. Its faith in business was gone and the country looked toward government as the arbiter of change. Franklin Roosevelt was handed many priorities for reform which promised an innovative transformation of national institutions. Yet, what emerged as the basic premises of the New Deal from 1933-1939 was a hodge-podge of conservatism, state capitalism and para-radical measures which did little to alter the basic structures that had created the Depression. As one historian had observed (Bernstein, 1968, pp.264-265):

> The New Deal failed to solve the problem of depression, it failed to raise the impoverished, it failed to redistribute income, it failed to extend equality....It failed generally to make business more responsible to the social welfare or to threaten business's pre-eminent political power. In this sense, the New Deal, despite the shifts in tone and spirit from the earlier decade, was profoundly conservative and continuous with the 1920's.

The New Deal preserved the conservative institutional framework by absorbing more diverse and dissident groups into its political framework; under the Wagner Act and the Agricultural Adjustment Act, farmers and unions became part of the alliance with the government. Public relief agencies, such as the Civilian Conservation Corps and the Public Works Administration, helped to alleviate some of the direct suffering by vast programs of public works and relief, which allowed the unemployed poor a

voice in government. All of these reforms made it harder to starve in America, and gave Roosevelt the confidence of the poor which greatly decreased the threat of overt revolution (Wehle, 1953, p. 226).

Roosevelt took the wind out of many radical threats of social transformation by turning the rhetoric of social revolution into reform programs that diluted the radical appeal. When Huey Long's "Share Our Wealth" program called for the redistribution of income above a certain amount, Roosevelt responded with the Inheritance Tax Act designed to "soak the rich." Union radicalism and the growing number of strikes in 1934 pushed Roosevelt to a hesitant acceptance of the right to unionize. In this limited sense, the New Deal was responsive to social reform, but it did little to radically restructure the deeper inequalities of capitalism. Even the landmark Social Security Act, which acknowledged the commonweal, still made the workers responsible for their pensions; government contributed nothing. The critical shift was that government under the New Deal was able to exercise a policy of containment of change, which strengthened the state by adjusting the most radical demands to a consensus of compromise. More and more, the political institutions determined that change could come only from within the established system. Government had grown so powerful that isolated radical groups bent under the pressures of centralization.

In part, this new strength of political institutions was due to the New Deal's alliance with business. Through measures such

as the National Recovery Act and the Securities Exchange Act, government exerted increasing control on capitalism and finance. Through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, the government extended credit to businesses and the building construction contractors. One commentator states that the significance of these reforms was, "the financial center of the nation shifted from Wall Street to Washington (Leuchtenberg, 1963, p. 335)." This critical movement toward centralization of business and government reached its full strength during World War II. The New Deal had not solved the Depression, for it was the drive toward rearmament and industrial supply of material that brought an upsurge in production and employment. Government and business became partners in a system in which government defined priorities, business carried them out, and prosperity was insured.

The critical effect of the New Deal reforms was an increasing interconnectedness of institutions and individuals. The state, under Roosevelt, had created a vast series of liasons with industry, workers, farmers and financiers which created a centralized network of dependency. This change created a major transformation in the pattern of individualism. Charles Reich has (1970, p. 60) noted that the general theme that lingered after the New Deal was <u>domination</u>:

> ...these years had convinced much of America that its people must be placed under the control of something larger and more rational than individual self-restraint; that individual man, must for the good of all, become part of a system.

In this weakening of individual powers, the state and society gradually became one large organization. While it was not precisely totalitarian, the centralizing impulse did result in the creation of a public state that was a gargantuan corporation, which entered into private and economic life in increasing channels of influence.

During this period, the assertion of self counted for less and less. The New Deal had established the antithesis for the dialectic of revolt in the 1960's. The cry for self and for liberation from institutions was a direct reply to many of the inadequacies of New Deal reform. Man had become part of an institution which smothered individual freedom with a collective security.

The Black Revolution of the 1960's

The black protest for equality in the 1960's represents the first significant postwar attempt to challenge the hegemony of institutional interconnectedness and inertia. During the 1950's, the wave of McCarthyism and the "organization man" syndrome of conformity controlled public individualism and radicalism with tight reins. The collective identity superseded personal identity as the mentality of mass uniformity gripped the imagination in a wave of institutional loyalty. Patriotism was equated with not rocking the collective boat. The black revolt upset the stability of this tranquil mood. For like radicals of the past, the blacks had challenged the system's core of idealism. By demanding equality in

both a political and moral sense, they had gone to the roots of the democratic faith to awaken social inertia. The black struggle against this institutional indifference became the catalytic spark of rebellion that awakened the decade to the possibility of radical democracy.

On February 1, 1960, a group of black college students launched the movement for black liberation by sitting-in at a "whites only" section in a Woolworth's store in Raleigh, North Carolina. The first day they were escorted away. But the following day the blacks came back in large numbers to protest. Many were beaten and jailed by angry whites, but the spark had ignited. Suddenly all over the South, there was a wave of sit-ins, read-ins, kneel-ins, wade-ins to secure rights which had supposedly been procured by the Civil War. Freedom riders attacked segregation practices in bus terminals, white students came South to help blacks register to vote, and mass marches of solidarity were conducted throughout the South.

This early stage of liberation, the movement for Civil Rights, was viewed by Southern whites as a violent threat to the social order. Ironically though, the Civil Rights workers were relatively tame. Led by Martin Luther King, the movement was a "revolution to get in." The blacks merely wanted to be admitted to full citizenship and equality in white society (Newfield, 1966, p. 4). In effect, blacks believed in the power of democracy to respond to mass sentiment, and enact laws that would give equal

rights. Guided by Dr. King, the appeal of Civil Rights was to morality and equality. The blacks had made their political appeal on Christian and pacifist grounds. They would not counter the violence of the South with more violence.

In the wake of this appeal to traditional rhetoric and democracy, many laws were passed to insure some of the blacks' civil rights. President Kennedy ordered federal marshalls to go south to insure black voter registration. In 1964, Congress approved a massive civil rights law which enforced the right to vote and described sanctions against discrimination in public accomodations. Yet the naivete of the belief in law soon became apparent. Civil rights were not human rights. Laws alone could not answer the larger questions of racism, urban ghettos and white violence. By 1965, these deeper questions had splintered the civil rights movement. The blacks' earlier optimism in the system's ability to change was fading. And with the emergence of Vietnam, suddenly government began to "forget" about blacks. Funds that would have gone to the poor now went to the war effort. The result was that the blacks began to withdraw into their own culture; they were alienated from white controlled institutions which mouthed theoretical equality while concealing great factual inequalities.

This new phase of liberation promoted a solidification of black identity. Now an emphasis was placed on subcultural isolation and psychic transformation. Politics became a culture.

Stokely Carmichael became the prophet of this period; with his cry for black power, he heightened awareness of oppression--"Black people in this country form a colony and it is not in the interest of the colonial power to liberate them (Carmichael and Hamilton, 1967, p.5)." Through a psychic purgation the blacks disentangled themselves from a white identity. A new emphasis was placed on Afro-American history and a positive imagery of blackness.

This cleansing of white identity took a variety of forms. The Black Muslim movement founded in Detroit in the 1930's received revived interest in the 1960's. The Muslim movement was a counter community within the ghetto with the Muslim temple as its focus. The temple became a symbol of the Muslim separation from white culture, as it ideologically called for the separation of the races and emphasized black pride and militant racism as counter-agents to a "white-washed" identity. A fierce cultural pride was maintained through the teaching of Afro-American culture and the stress upon a rigid, purifying discipline of clean living and industriousness as a cure for the loss of self pride among blacks (Essien-Udom, 1962, p.121).

Another group that gained national attention during the latter part of the 1960's was the Black Panther Party. The Panthers called for black people "to pick up the gun" and gain their manhood. For the gun was the modern symbol of subjugation; it was the means used by the police to keep blacks in line. By arming people, the Panthers wanted to end the mystique of intimidation that the police

used on ghetto dwellers (Anthony, 1970, pp.15-16). But violence was only a part of their program. The Panthers wanted blacks to think collectively and disavow the cult of white individualism by creating a meaningful black community. "Power to the people" became more than a slogan; it was a program of action. The Panthers fostered a collective identity by sponsoring a liberation school program for educating blacks about their cultural heritage and the strategies of political action. In the "breakfast for children" program, they made certain that black children got one decent meal every day (Moore, 1971, p.265).

Yet, compared to the unanimity of the early 1960's civil rights movement, the black movement was in disarray. While all could agree on the pride of being black, the question of culture versus politics became confused, and there was a splintering of purposes. At first the black movement believed in the nation and the promise of American idealism. But when blacks became conscious of the totality of white cultural and institutional inertia, and of the indifference to the ideals of egalitarianism, they dropped out. The blacks withdrew into the sanctum of community to transform themselves before they changed the world. While such a process led to isolated solidarity, it also led to diffuse individuality; tactics and principles became uncertain. Once the realm of politics was abandoned, culture became a political statement with unclear directions.

It is this basic dynamic of disillusion with social/political institutions and the withdrawal into community that soon be-

came the cycle for white radicals in the 1960's. The black experience became a metaphor for the process of transformation. The white radicals' failure to significantly change the political system's policy of war, or the educational establishment's undemocratic paternalism, resulted in futile exasperation with the liberal institutions which were so powerful and interconnected that significant transformation was impossible. Reaction and withdrawal set in. If one could not find equality and harmony in the institutionally-controlled outer world, then perhaps one could go inside a counter community to find peace there. A renewed sense of political impotence led to attempts at cultural solutions. Counter institutions arose to support withdrawal with community solidarity.

CULTURAL REBELLION

The drive toward cultural rebellion has been part of the social process since colonial times. The early immigration movement represented an exile from one community and the voyage toward the New World's promise of utopia. D. H. Lawrence (1971, p. 3) expressed the significance of this:

> They came largely to get away--that most simple of motives. To get away. Away from what? In the long run, away from themselves....To get away from everything they are and have been.

The immigration process foreshadows the mobility and restlessness ingrained in the social dynamic of America; the movement away from oppression toward Arcadian insulation served as a critical escape valve in the search for freedom.

Gradually, the primitive settlement evolves into a civilization. The terror and uncertainty of the wilderness were subdued, and the hardships of exile were forgotten. But the restlessness and the search for new Unknowns were not dead. The concept of the new world as an escape from oppression now became an indigenous sentiment. Newer frontiers of growth were discovered within the continent, and so the cycle of rebellion renewed itself:

> American social development has been continually beginning over again on the frontier. This perennial rebirth, this fluidity of American life, this expansion westward with its new opportunities, its continuous touch with the simplicity of American society, furnish the forces dominating American character (Turner, 1920, pp. 2-3).

This restlessness of frontier expansion becomes symbolic in its cultural context. It might be expressed overtly as an exile to the wilderness, but its force could also be felt in later times as expatriates went to the Left Bank, or Bohemians went "on the road," or as the hallucinogenic rebels explored the wilderness within. Yet, it is this process of escape and motion toward the uncertain that forms a basic dynamic in American cultural radicalism.

Cultural radicalism is a consistent process in American society. It is the deepest expression of the doctrine of individualism and self-determination. It finds its culmination in a community, often isolated and withdrawn from the mainstream of culture. In this section, we will consider three main expressions of this tendency in the early communal movement, the Transcendentalists and modern Bohemianism.

The Communal Movement

During the period from roughly 1730 to 1860 hundreds of communal ventures were started in the United States. At first, most of the communes were religious sects which sought in isolation the perfection of individuals and society. Later, the dominant motif of communes became socialistic to offset the evils of industrialism and capitalism. While both phases had distinctly unique ideologies, they shared a general sense that the world of mainstream culture was sinful and decadent. Only through isolation and communal insulation could they save themselves and serve as seeds from which a new and better order could grow.

Yet, all of the communes were intimately linked to the larger society which catalyzed the utopian ferment. It was the mood of society at large which created the utopian ambience. The sense of freedom and experimentation in American culture created a feeling of optimism in the utopian communities. The communal movement represented a halfway solution to the larger societal problems of economics, freedom and spirituality. The utopians rejected overt revolution or radical subversion, and resolved the social dilemma by the creation of experimental communities that would point to the path of perfection for the rest of society to follow. The communes were thus part of a millenial and democratic fervor that overtook the young nation, and were a search to express freedom in a closed society. As Arthur Bestor has observed of communal ideology (1970, p.16):

> Its faith that men can remake their institutions by reasoned choice evoked natural response in the United States, whose people believed they had done this very thing in their constitution making. The communitarian belief in social harmony as opposed to class warfare was certainly the prevalent hope of Americans generally. The communitarian emphasis upon voluntary action met exactly the American conception of freedom. The experimental aspect of communitarianism found ready echo in a nation of experimenters...

Thus, communes were a cultural solution to problems of politics and freedom, based on values from the larger society.

Religious Communes

The religious communes which began in the 1700's were composed of both indigenous settlers and immigrants whose unusual beliefs and life styles often made them unwelcome in the mainstream

society. Many communes formed by immigrants found their roots in European oppression. The Rappites, founded in Germany by George Rapp in the late 1700's, attempted to reform the Lutheran Church; when they incurred the punishment of the civil and religious authorities, they left Germany for America. Ann Lee, organizer of the Shakers, believed that violent agitations of the body were revelations of the divine. When this doctrine resulted in her imprisonment and persecution by the English government, she and her followers left for America. In a search for religious tolerance, America's promise of freedom acted like a magnet to pull the immigrants away from persecution toward liberation.

The religious utopians were infected with a millenial faith and a reverence for the radical primitivism of the early Christians. A belief that the millenium was at hand and that Christ's second coming was imminent tinged the communalists with a sense of urgency to perfect themselves and society for heaven on earth. In their view, society at large was evil, sinful, and debauched and was an inadequate organization to receive the perfectionist regeneration of the millenium. In the throes of this apocalypse, the believers felt they must withdraw and realize utopia in isolation. The religious communes premised their beliefs upon a literal interpretation of the Bible, which was used to justify their experiments. They rejected all existing social and religious hierarchies and theological dogmas, and found in the Bible a complete guide for action. Their model was the primitive Christian who left society to live in purity and simplicity (Tyler, 1962, pp.109-110).

This millennial fervor helps to explain many of the unusual practices of the religious communitarians. Because many of the peasants who immigrated were poor, adoption of economic communism became a necessity. Yet, the leaders used the Bible and the experience of the early Christians to rationalize this communism into a life-style that fulfilled the divine command. In the Amana colony, high rents in Germany drove the settlers to America, where. to purchase land, it became a necessity to pool resources and hold property in common. Yet, once established, the community of goods could not be so easily given up. Amana's leaders received revelation after revelation that affirmed the holiness of communism.

The adoption by many communes of celibacy also arose from their radical religious faith. Celibacy not only reflected the monastic sexuality of Christ, but it represented the moral discipline and spiritual purity that were prerequisites for establishing the kingdom of heaven on earth. The Shakers adopted celibacy, because sexuality was regarded as a manifestation of the devilish and sensual state of degenerate society. In addition, they believed that since the millenium was at hand, there was no further need for propagating the human race.

Because many communes maintained a harsh dichotomy between the utopian world of spiritual perfection and the earthly world of material society, special phrases were used to emphasize the unique identity of the group. The Oneida community called its

members Saints, and the Shakers were the Society of Believers. In their view, the rest of the world were outsiders and were barred from entry into the utopian Eden. This negative conception of the outside world, backed by religious conviction, was a major factor in the successful communes, while unsuccessful communes tended to shy away from a harsh delineation between the commune and the world (Kanter, 1972, p. 84). In addition, the sense of separateness tended to promote experimentation in life-styles. Since the utopians were different from the rest of society, values tended to be unique and the life-style became a visible expression of their apartness. Vegetarianism, new styles of attire, and equality between the sexes became symbols of their exclusion from the mainstream society.

The religious communes were heavily dependent upon strong leadership to maintain stability and continuance of the experiment. In this millennial fervor, the strong leader was obliged to possess charisma and the miraculous powers of a demi-god. Often when the strong leader lost interest in the venture or died, the commune could not survive. George Rapp had a magical, charismatic personality which held the community of Harmony in virtual dictatorship. He preached sermons, heard confessions and was the arbiter of communal moral standards. When he died, membership gradually dissolved because the magnetic focus of utopian purpose was no longer there. Jemina Wilkinson, founder of the New Jerusalem commune in New York, convinced her followers she was

a reincarnated being who had been resurrected from the dead. It was believed that she could perform miracles, heal and relate prophecies. When she died and failed to be resurrected for a second time, no personality was strong enough to succeed her; she was the commune and thus membership and property were dissolved.

Socialistic Communes

With the growing secularization of life in the 1800's the communal movement underwent a subtle shift in emphasis. The religiously-oriented sense of the disintegration of society now was transformed into a secular belief in the apocalypse. The growth of industrialism was turning the world into an evil, material environment of destruction. The new secular utopians believed that capitalism had produced a world of hateful men and selfish money grubbers. People became insecure and alienated from their society. The utopians argued that if this evil environment could be transformed, then man would again have the opportunity to be good, brotherly and unselfish. To realize this, they believed that communitarian groups should create small experimental microcosms of social and economic perfection to provide a model for the rest of society to follow (Gide, 1930, p.122).

Yet the transition from the sacred to the secular was incomplete. The socialistically-oriented utopias were still filled with the spirit of holy perfectionism. The world, at least in its present state, remained a moral evil. Only a revolution of the

spirit through community could allow man to realize salvation.

But the belief in redemptive perfection was still becoming more earthly. The appeals of moral perfection and religious utopia were directed toward secular programs of reform. Frances Wright's community of Nashoba was designed as a refuge for slaves who wished to work toward the purchase of their freedom. The transcendental community of Brook Farm placed a great emphasis upon reforms in education and an experimental school as a means of secular salvation.

Robert Owen and Charles Fourier were the two major figures in the period of the secularization of communes. Owen was a rich Scottish industrialist who had established a model factory in New Lankark that provided many humanitarian benefits for the workers, such as shorter working hours, kindergarten schools and fair wages. But Owen wished to extend this perfectionism to society at large. Believing that man was a product of the environment, Owen proposed completely new surroundings to create a new individual. He at first proposed establishing a small communtiy of 1200 people, mostly composed of the poor and unemployed, in small units of villages, to be self sufficient through farming and local crafts. But then he extended the principle to all the world; his system would be the salvation of industrial misery and would embrace all classes in a cooperative hierarchy of villages. Thus, Owen's major purposes were social, not economic. He wished to bring

a rational society into being which would promote welfare and education (Bestor, 1970, pp.72-78).

In 1825, he came to American to implement his utopia. He purchased the old Rappite commune of Harmony, Indiana, and renamed it New Harmony. Owen created a temporary constitution that recognized him as sole proprietor of the enterprise and created a system of labor credits at the public store. Yet after nine months, Owens abandoned the cooperative proprietorship and turned New Harmony into a communistic system. Dissension immediately arose over the issue of communism, and factions split off to form their own communal ventures. Part of Owen's difficulty lay in his unselective process of admission; dreamers and intellectuals were preponderant, and were more interested in factional theorizing than hard work or community. In addition, Owen had made poor preparation. Overcrowding was rampant. He could not find enough skilled craftsmen to keep the community orderly and productive. As a result of these influences, consumption of goods greatly exceded production. Thus, by 1827, America's first experiment with socialism on a European model had failed.

The wave of enthusiasm for Owenite communities paved the way of acceptance for Charles Fourier's theories of utopia. Born in France in 1772, Fourier, like Owen, believed that the environment determined character. To recreate the natural harmony disturbed by industry and society, Fourier proposed a complex agricultural

community called a Phalanx, covering an area of three square miles. At the center of it would be the Phalanstery, which was a vast three-story building that would provide all of the members' basic and recreational needs. The Phalanx was to be a cooperative venture; however, profits would be distributed capitalistically based on labor and the size of the initial contribution. Although this utopia was detached from the rest of society, Fourier believed that the system of Phalanxes would spread over the earth and finally unite the world in brotherhood (Holloway, 1951, pp.136-137).

The implementation of the Phalanx during the 1840's in America was very fragmentary. Only three Phalanxes were moderate successes, and only one, the North American Phalanx, survived more than ten years. In part, the failure was due to a lack of funds and to improper planning. Fourier had envisioned a thoroughly worked-out system of community, ably financed and with common group interests. But most American phalanxes were poorly located, inadequately financed and unable to bind the members in a communal spirit. At a deeper level, the problem was that the zeitgeist of radical democracy in the 1840's was giving way to an atmosphere of realism in the 1850's which sapped the utopian enthusiasm in many ways.

The most interesting and successful of the secular communes was the Oneida community founded by John Humphrey Noyes in the

1840's. The success of the commune may be attributed to Noyes' insistence upon accomodation to both the spiritual and economic ideals of utopianism. Noyes believed that socialism could not exist without a religious base to bind the members' loyalties. This fusion of religion and economics, together with Noyes' leadership abilities, ignored by the Owenites and the Fourierists, perhaps accounts for the longevity of Oneida.

Noyes created his own sect called the Perfectionists. He believed it was possible for man to fulfill himself on earth and create paradise. Noyes rejected the concept of original sin and its accompanying weight of guilt, because it was this illusionary sinful depravity that prevented man from perfecting himself. This freedom from guilt allowed Noyes to experiment with moral values. He created at Oneida the doctrine of complex marriage, which was essentially free love in a group marriage. Noyes argued that people whould be free to choose their sexual partners for an indeterminate amount of time, to prevent the usual onset of monotony and boredom that plagued ordinary marital relationships. The complex marriage was carefully regulated by the community, and most observers agreed that it was a vital factor in maintaining communitarian bonds.

Another innovation in the Oneida community was the practice of "mutual criticism." One member of the community burdened with a moral problem or personal guilt would meet with a select committee that represented the community. The member sat in silence

while the group enumerated the faults and merits of the person and concluded with specific reproofs and practical advice for improved conduct. Noyes' mutual criticism was a primitive form of psychotherapy and even "cured" psychosomatic illnesses. Its importance as a bond of community was crucial, for it allowed for individual dissent within a group context.

Economically, Oneida was outstandingly successful. After pooling their goods in a socialistic corporation, the group struggled at first but then became very prosperous through the manufacture of fur traps and other items of high craftsmanship. These profits allowed them to purchase new lands and to establish another commune. Their success allowed them to hire laborers to perform works of drudgery. In addition, money allowed Oneida to move from simplicity to a sophisticated culture. They were tolerant of free inquiry and established a large comprehensive library and discussion groups. They even had an orchestra and sent their children to the best colleges.

Yet, by the 1870's the community's ties began to break. Pressured by local clergy about his free love doctrines, Noyes fled to Canada, and transferred the leadership to his son. But Oneida could not accept the son becaue he was an agnostic and lived aloof from the community. Factions arose and due to these pressures, the doctrine of complex marriage was abandoned in 1879. Since the doctrine was so central to group solidarity,

its removal spelled the end of community. In 1882, the shares of ownership were transferred to a joint stock company and the venture dissolved.

Decline of Communes

The intense phase of communal growth had ended by the 1870's. While a few sects, like the Shakers, survived into the twentieth century, the wave of communalism was essentially dead. Assessing the causes of decline at the most general level, we can attribute the earlier fervor to the wave of antebellum millenial radicalism. The zeitgeist of an optimistic, expansive sense of freedom had brought forth the feeling that life was an experiment. But with the onset of the Civil War and its after-effect of weariness, much of this enthusiastic buoyancy waned. The communes were a function of social mood; when the sustaining optimism passed, they declined.

In addition, the environment was changing. The intrusion of the industrial order and consumer products sent waves through the agrarian utopias. How should they relate to change? The commune became an island surrounded by industrial society. If new goods and life styles were introduced, it worked to the detriment of communal integrity and commitment. Original schemes became diluted and outside influences eroded the communal ideal.

A sociologist, Rosabeth Kanter (1972) argues that this problem of two pulls of communal loyalty is at bottom the conflict

between Gemeinschaft and Gesellschaft. The Gemeinschaft aspects of the utopian communites consisted of the emotional, personal, and loving values that support community. Gesellschaft aspects of community are the reality-oriented tasks that enable the group to survive, such as the production and exchange of goods. Kanter contends that many nineteenth century communes moved away from community values to Gesellschaft. The result was that the community's quest for worldly success interfered with its internal values of communal harmony. This change meant the end of community and its transformation into a specialized organization. The two notorious examples are Oneida and the Amana colony. Oneida became a silverware firm, losing its community; and Amana followed the same process in its production of refrigerators. By being pulled into the larger world which they had at first forsaken, the communes lost much of their internal stability and ideological cohesion (Kanter, pp.148-153). The cycle of withdrawal and return had been fulfilled.

TRANSCENDENTALISM

The New England Transcendental movement represented the fruition of a native zeitgeist that touched many aspects of American culture from social reform to literature. Centered in Concord, Massachusetts, during the period of 1835-1850, transcendentalism was the philosophic creation of a small elite of intellectuals and dreamers who revolted from the ironclad values of Calvinism and materialism. The transcendentalists attacked the gods of convention and offered in their place a pantheism congruent with the American Eden, and an idealism that touched the mystical roots of individualism. Yet if it had been solely a philosophic movement, its importance to contemporary counter-cultural movements would be minimal. The transcendentalists' nexus with contemporary rebellions lies in their critique of American culture and the solutions they proposed. The same social questions that beseiged later rebels and bohemians were faced squarely a century earlier. The destruction of the land, the loss of self in conformity, and the diabolical lust for monetary rewards drove the transcendentalists to find channels of liberation very similar to contemporary rebels' paradises. Isolation, communes and a mystical religious outlook became key features of the transcendental revolt. It is through this experiential core of anarchic individualism that the transcendental movement is linked to the future expression of counter-institutional revolt.

Ralph Waldo Emerson

In the 1830's, Ralph Waldo Emerson "dropped out" from the Unitarian ministry to find God and wisdom through isolation and meditation. His meditations, appearing in the form of essays, were the philosophic core of the Concord movement.

Emerson's philosophy represents the first native expression of a radical concept of self. It consisted of the adoration of nature, which proceeded from democratic assumptions and arrived at a primitive vision of man and his world that was free of custom and social mores. The key concept in this system was nature. To Emerson, nature was much more than the physical environment, for it represented a spiritual world also. Nature was the realm of unchanging essences and absolutes that manifested themselves in the physical world of appearance. Emerson and his followers worshipped nature because its material form was only a symbol of the invisible order and universal laws that lay behind it. One went to nature, to the wilderness, not only to enjoy its beauty and serenity, but to discover in its visible appearance the unseen realm which it intimated. In this sanctification of the land, Emerson had fused romanticism and the American cult of Eden into a mystic system of pantheism and isolated meditation.

Emerson argued that it was through the consciousness of man which mediated nature and the realm of absolutes that the essential unity of the cosmos was realized. Man's understanding of the bond between the material and the spiritual was the only means to achieve a mystic wholeness which created transcendence. In this identity between man, world, and spirit, the self became synonymous with the universe itself. The world flowed outward from an invisible center of spirit contained within the individual (Emerson, p. 89). By an act of irrational intuition, man became his world and the cosmos became man.

However paradoxical this system may appear, it was the springboard for the leap into a radical conception of the self that would ignite Thoreau and others in the transcendental movement. In effect, Emerson had deified man and had placed an extraordinary emphasis upon the identity of self and the Absolute. The mystic assertion of individualism produced men who believed that their own powers of transformation were above the control of human institutions. Emerson had fused the democratic sense of the free individual with a concept of self that suggested a new importance for the individual in America. It was from these roots that an archaic conception of self developed which opened the way to an articulate comprehension of the importance of rebellion and cultural withdrawal as a means of liberation from an immoral society.

Emerson's emphasis upon the self was absolute and unyielding to social restraints--"whoso would be a man, must be a nonconformist (Emerson, p. 148)." Emerson believed that man must be self-reliant; to be dependent upon society, government or material possessions only weakened the inner strength of the individual. Man creates his world, his society, from within; the laws that he obeys are the words of his inner conscience. This viewpoint implied a rejection of the authority of external institutions and their values. For America of the 1840's, this refusal to submit to social control was the negation of the material greed and exploitation that seemed to promise the destruction of the American dream. To counteract this, he proposed solitude and withdrawal to reunite self and world--"Build therefore your own world. As fast as you conform your life to the pure idea in your mind, that [idea] will unfold its great proportions. (Emerson, p. 42)." Thus intuition and the inner voice became more important than the common sense world of society. Even if the world calls these solitary individuals insane or contradictory, they must persist in their quest for the spirit within (Emerson, p. 94):

> It is a sign of our times...that many intelligent and religious persons withdraw themselves from the common labors and competitions of the market and the caucus, and betake themselves to a certain solitary and critical way of living....They hold themselves aloof: they feel the disproportion between their faculties and the work offered them, and they prefer to ramble in the country and perish of ennui.... They are striking work, and crying out for something worthy to do!

Obviously, the overtones of Emerson's sytem were prophetic. His description of the aimlessness of American life and his prescription of withdrawal touch the core of later rebellions.

However, Emerson was a thinker and an eminently unpractical man. His activity was thinking, not doing. It would take the more practical members of the transcendental circle to translate his words into a life style.

Henry David Thoreau

Thoreau was the disciple who took the Emersonian doctrines and attempted to live by them. Thoreau absorbed the abstract absolutes of Emerson and made them viable by testing through experience the premises of unbridled individualism. It was this 'Do It!' attitude that made Thoreau so important a figure in the historical tradition of heroic self-assertion.

On July 4, 1845, Thoreau began his two-year stay at Walden Pond. Cynically aloof and indifferent to employment, his hermit's solace at Walden offered a solution to the rampant materialism and strangulating conformity of his day. Thoreau's answer to the social catastrophe was an exaltation of the ego as the true path of cosmic liberation. Reform began from within. Thoreau rejected the group and mass politics approach to social change and celebrated the reform of the self as the only enduring means to change the world. If one changed his personal values and consciousness, then the world itself would be reformed and

transformed. Thoreau's solution was an extension of transcendental self-reliance, but he arrived at a radical image of the ego that was obedient to higher laws of conduct that sprang from the wisdom of the inner self; "Nay, be a Columbus to whole new continents and worlds within you, opening new channels, not of trade, but of thought. Every man is the lord of a realm beside which the earthly empire of the Czar is but a petty state.... (Thoreau, 1950, p. 286)." His successful stay at Walden proved that the exploration of inner space and consciousness transformation was a valid means of social transformation.

Walden was equally an experiment in simplicity. By going there, Thoreau wanted to strip civilization of its facades of sophistication and find the underlying essence beneath the world of appearances. As he progressed upon this mystic path of negation, he discovered that everyday social values had less and less importance to the world within. The frantic rush of his countrymen for wealth, prestige and imperialistic exploitation became a sham of illusion and immorality; they had neglected the tranquility and non-doing of meditation and silence before nature which brought the more important wealth of contentment and wisdom. These individuals were no longer masters of their fate; they had so complicated the world with the empty platitudes of wealth and progress that they had lost control of themselves--"We do not ride upon the railroad, it rides upon us. (Thoreau,

1950, p. 83)." To regain the promise of personal freedom, the liberty originally intended in the spirit of America, Thoreau proposed that, first, man should not attach himself to the institutions of the state. For it was the constant interference of these institutions, demanding loyalty and self-denying obedience, that made society so desperate and intolerant of the creative faculties of man. The individual's loyalty should be only to himself; the institutions merely created a prison of repression around freedom.

Thoreau's answer to this bogus system of civilized controls was the celebration of wildness and primitivism. He exalted the primeval situation where man was forced to live by his instincts and cherish his environment. He respected the Indian who lived in sacred contact with nature and who celebrated the simplicity of an organic harmony of man and world. Wildness brought out the sacredness of the bond between the uncluttered natural environment and the simple, instinctual and unrepressed individual. As one opened himself to the wilderness without and within, nature "spoke" and revealed the intuitive laws of the cosmic self. The result was primeval simplicity which ironically convoluted civilized values and returned man to a vision of innocence. Thoreau wrote (Thoreau, 1950, p. 288):

> In proportion as he simplifies his life, the laws of the universe will appear to be less complex, and solitude will not be solitude, nor poverty poverty, nor weakness weakness. If you have built castles in

> the air, your work need not be lost; that is where they should be. Now put the foundations under them.

Thoreau's influence upon later generations of rebels cannot be underestimated. In his quest for an instinctual and irrational self free of the impositions of society, Thoreau had established a personal model of comparison by which the unfettered individual could measure the heroic dimensions of cultural radicalism.

Brook Farm

The emphasis of the transcendentalists upon the individual should not obscure their accompanying acceptance of community as the means which allowed the fullest expression of personal growth through group solidarity. While many members rejected the American community at large, they did not deny the necessity for those with utopian visions to erect a self-contained society.

The founding of the utopian experiment of Brook Farm in 1841 was the culmination of this quest. Brook Farm was the product of the transcendental fervor to exalt the self and at the same time unite the individual with others to create a perfect society on earth (Hinds, 1908, p. 256). Its founder, George Ripley, wanted a community where the needs of the spiritual and the material were balanced and complemented each other. Ripley believed it possible to create a situation where the working self and thinking self could exist in harmony. Labor on the farm was adapted to the taste and talents of the members. Work al-

lowed the member to live in harmony with nature, while drawing sustenance from the land. But labor also had its spiritual side. This simple economy was designed for the liberation of the individual. Brook Farm was planned to allow each member the utmost freedom from material cares in order to develop oneself, culturally and spiritually.

The most significant realization of this goal was in the Brook Farm schools, which were incredibly advanced for their time. There was an infant school for children under six, a primary school and a six-year preparatory course to prepare students for college. Students were expected to work two or more hours per day at manual labor to pay for their board and to promote an acceptance of work as a means to culture. The innovative feature of the schools was in the curriculum and methods of instruction. The system was based upon complete freedom of intercourse between students and faculty. Classes were held informally and geared to students' needs. The hierarchy of teacher above pupil was abandoned; faculty and students shared in the learning experience on equal terms. In addition, the curriculum was a radical departure from the classical model. Drawing classes, botany and agronomy were instituted, for perhaps the first time in American education. Appreciation of classical music was taught. Because of its openness to experimentation and its respect for the individual, the Brook Farm schools were the most

fruitful product of the utopia, anticipating advances that would not appear until the twentieth century.

Originally, Brook Farm had been organized as a joint stock company with a para-socialistic organization. But by 1844, the farm had proved to be economically unstable. Due to mounting debts, the members decided to transform the commune into a Fourierist phalanx, with the aim of attracting new members and more finances. But once the plan was implemented, a series of financial and natural disasters destroyed enthusiasm and solvency. As a result, it was decided in 1845 to dissolve Brook Farm. While it had lasted, the utopia had offered a flexibility and degree of innovation that made it a potent expression of the deepest transcendental idealism.

The importance of the Transcendental movement is its response to a rapidly industrializing society. Emerson, Thoreau and others had prophetically understood the implications of the acquisitive ethos that was transforming America. They sought to recover the idea of America which the wave of materialism threatened to engulf. This idea was rooted in a spiritual conception of self and liberty which overturned many of the dominant Western values of rationality and causality. The Transcendentalists' emphasis upon the invisible and exaltation of consciousness change led them into paths antithetical to the consensus of society. They celebrated the irrational, the mystical and the

Oriental sense of paradox in an anti-institutional setting. More importantly, the answers that they arrived at were almost archetypes for future Bohemian movements. The belief in art as salvation, the acceptance of non-conformity, the dichotomy of wilderness versus society, the reliance upon self-transformation, and the search for a unique community of the gifted and deviant became dominant motifs in later forms of revolt, such as the Lost Generation and the Beats. The transcendentalists had created a native form of rebellion that became an unstated existential core for the future.

BOHEMIANISM

The word "bohemian" originally denoted a gypsy, a nomad in search of the new; but its modern meaning comes from France in the middle of the nineteenth century. The sons of village craftsmen came to the bulging, industrial city of Paris to find that they had no employable skills needed by society. In their frustration and alienation, they revolted from a world that denied them a place. This was not a revolt of politics or violence, for these bohemians were still puritans and sentimentally attached to the bourgeoisie. Rather, they rebelled in the name of merriment. They sat, impoverished and drunk, in the small cafes plotting theoretical utopias, proclaiming the importance of the arts and declaiming the decadent values of the Philistines (Parry, xxi).

In future years, bohemianism would become more than a mere response to the dislocating effects of industrialism, for it became a complete identity of escape for the middle class. It was a total life-style that offered the opportunity to exile oneself from convention and gentility, and to live in a world of the sensuous and the carefree. The bohemian created a unique world inside himself, and joined with others in community to protect and isolate himself from the invasions of the civilized and the decent.

The appearance of bohemia is intimately related to the social barometer. Lasch suggests that mass society lacks the cohesive influences that create a genuine community; therefore it

tends to break up into smaller communities which are relatively autonomous and self-contained (Lasch, 1967, p.69). Bohemia, whether in Paris, Greenwich Village or the North Beach, is the attempt to build an intimate community to restore dignity to the uniqueness of the individual and warmth to social interactions.

In addition, bohemia is tied to a specific historical situation that repeats itself with cyclic frequency. In a period of relative, yet superficial, social calm a wave of underground ferment and disorientation begins. Generally, the bohemian with avant-garde sensitivity and intellect understands that the social values of his times no longer match the actuality of conditions. In sensing that the outer world's order is breaking down and dissolving into nothing, the bohemian revolts to create a new code of conduct and meaning denied in the chaos of society at large. During the false tranquility of the post-World War I period, the hypocrisy and empty morality of the older generation drove many people of the younger generation into bohemian exile to rediscover themselves. From the confident and complacent serenity of the 1950's, the members of the Beat generation were awakened to the underlying indifference and irrationality of a post-industrial and nuclear bomb-threatened world. In this belief in the breakdown of value and meaning, the image of apocalypse creates a fervent sense of mission for the bohemians, as they search for artistic and communitarian salvation from a world they believe is doomed. In this

idealism, immense creative energies are released which often result in a zeitgeist such as found in the literary renaissance of Concord, or in the beat poetry of the fifties. But ultimately the flowering is short-lived; its intensity cannot be sustained. The social mood begins to corrupt the idealism and reality intrudes upon the dream. The Depression, for example, sapped the enthusiasm of the Lost Generation and the spirit of hope turned into despair. Once this process intrudes, the movement dissipates; later it will be reborn.

The Village: Pre-World War I

In the 1900-1917 period, the first large-scale bohemia appeared in Greenwich Village. The causes of its appearance are complex, but traceable to the milieu of the 1890's, when values and order appeared to be disintegrating. The cult of the individual and its corollary doctrines of self-determination and optimism gave way to a wave of industrialism and urbanism that smothered the individual in a society of the mass and in the anonymous self. A sense of confusion and drift reigned. The pace of technological change upset logical certainty. American assurance and confidence gave way to doubt and self-examination (Commager, 1959, p.43). Writers of the period, like Frank Norris and Theodore Dreiser, could no longer provide easy black and white solutions to social problems. So they shifted the blame to the cosmos; blind forces pushed the individual like a cork on the ocean, and this feeling of drift promised

small chance of control and order. In this situation, people believed that the individual counted for little; he was no longer the master of his fate.

Equally important was the breakdown of culture and tradition. The island communities of small-town America, with their rigid morality and sense of democracy, were breaking apart and dissolving into an amorphous urban mass where the old village values could no longer explain reality (Wiebe, 1967, p.5). This process was reflected in the family situation. The 1890's witnessed a mass discontent by the sons and daughters of the middle class with the world of their parents. Two visions of society were at odds. The children no longer accepted the authority of the parental world. The quest for status, gentility, puritanical morality and wealth could no longer exert effective social control over the community of youth. The division between the generations resulted in a schism of community, where the sense of shared culture and the continuity of tradition fell away (Lasch, 1967, p.70).

The growth of the pre-war Village was, in large part, a response to this loss of individuality and community. It was geographically isolated in New York City and this insulation offered its members a respite from the perceived social class pressures all around them. Because it was small and intimate, the Village allowed individuals a sense of community which they believed America was rapidly obliterating. Since these bohemians were to some degree alienated from the past and from traditional culture, this

feeling of rootlessness and pastlessness spurred them to live in terms of a future that was plastic and open to innovation.

The first symbolic bohemian hero to arise from this environment was Randolph Bourne. Crippled and twisted since childhood, the Village's isolation and easygoing tolerance allowed Bourne to be free of pitying stares. Within this community he was able to write brilliant essays on the upheavals in American society. These writings were prophecies for his generation and guided much of the ideological attack against the hollow values of a mass civilization. Bourne proclaimed youth as the saviour of society. He reduced history to a battle of generations, where youthful reform and innovation were diluted before they were accepted by society. Thus, the ideals of youth are never realized until they become middle-aged. Convention destroys idealism and thus:

> [I]t behooves youth to be not less radical, but even more radical, than it would naturally be. It must be not simply contemporaneous, but a generation ahead of its times, so that when it comes into control of the world, it will be precisely right and coincide with the conditions of the world....(Bourne, 1967, pp.15-16).

In this advocacy for youthfulness as social salvation, Bourne had proposed cultural solutions for political problems. He proclaimed a radical life-style as the ultimate political statement. When he died in 1918, his suffering and his words became a creed for the Lost Generation. A rebellion of style and personality rather than political violence came to characterize the future bohemian protests.

The pre-war Village also promoted the growth of new ideas. Bohemia's tradition of artistic and intellectual experimentation allowed its members to rebuild the premises of social order. A major focus of this ferment was a weekly salon held by the wealthy Mabel Dodge in 1912 and 1913. She invited many of the leading intellectuals and radicals of the day to her home. Issues such as socialism, feminism and psychoanalysis were heatedly debated and explored. Once, the salon even held an Indian peyote ceremony. This crystallization of ferment resulted in many new ventures. A socialist newspaper, The Masses, was begun and enjoyed a wide following among the radicals. In 1913, the tradition-breaking art work of the Armory Show arose from this spirit. It appeared that a cultural renaissance was brewing that would finally erect a tradition of the new to replace the outworn ideas and values.

But then World War I came. The patriotic fervor whipped up by the government proved to be a fatal blow to the Village, and to radicalism in general. Leading socialists like Eugene Debs were imprisoned. The Masses was removed from the newsstands and its contributors were tried under the Sedition Act. Conspicuous individualism was denied and a wave of allegiance and silence took its place. In this reign of terror, the life blood of the Village--freedom and tolerance--was sapped by the nation.

The Lost Generation

After World War I, a massive sense of alienation arose among youth, intellectuals and artists. They believed that American

civilization was botched, or as Ezra Pound expressed it, America was "an old bitch gone in the teeth." And so the disenchanted sought exile; they wanted to create a utopia of the spirit, a place where they were free from the contamination of American values. The lost generation flocked to Greenwich Village, Taos, Chicago, Paris and London to rebuild a world they believed in ruin.

At the core of their disillusion was the calamity of World War I. America, in her innocence, had entered the conflict with high-toned idealism. According to President Wilson, the war was a moral crusade fought to "make the world safe for democracy." Many of the young who joined the army believed naively in this ideal. But reality overturned ideals. The catastrophe of ten million deaths was beyond moral equations. The Versailles Treaty and the diplomatic machinations of the negotiating nations overturned the optimistic moralism and democratic liberalism inherent in the American position. Add to this the almost incomprehensible disorientation and dislocation felt by those men who actually fought in the war, and the climax was a fundamental schism resulting in disillusion. The members of the Lost Generation believed that they had been separated from all of the certainties that had moored pre-war values. The war had cut them off from their past, setting them adrift in the flux of incertainty.

The situation in America also hastened the process of spiritual exile. The Prohibition Amendment, passed in 1919, appeared to the young to be the symbolic summation of American

parochialism and rigidity. Prohibition was a perfect expression of the dogmatic morality and distaste for pleasure that the bohemians believed was the true nature of American society. The word that capsulized this concept was "Puritanism." To the Lost Generation, the nation was run by the Puritans, who were identical with the middle-class. The Puritan mentality determined the acceptable limits of behavior, decided what was proper art, and codified national legislation. The bohemians argued that this rigidity resulted in a serious loss of personal freedom. The equation was obvious. America was not free, she was controlled by Puritans; if a person wished to retain his unique sense of self he would have to look toward another country.

In addition, the Puritan attitude was perceived as linked with the mania for commercialism (Hoffman, 1955, p.326). Babbit walked hand in hand with Christ. To America of the 1920's, money was a sacred object, the reward of living by the Puritan virtues of thrift and honesty. This desperate haste to acquire goods and to conform to rigid standards of morality in the drive toward success gave the Lost Generation another reason for exile. They believed that the land was in the grip of a massive middle-class totalitarianism that countenanced no deviation from the strict dictates of materialism. America's material fury for acquisition had obliterated the spiritual side of man. The emphasis upon consumerism and on the buying of goods of dubious utility demonstrated the underlying emptiness of commercialism. The insanity

of this set of values forced the bohemian to celebrate his own aberrations. As one Village wit said, "Why be an industrial slave when you can be crazy? (Parry, 1960, p.305)."

Thus, the Lost Generation was alienated from the national community and society in general. As Malcolm Cowley expressed it: "It was lost because it accepted no older guides to conduct and because it had formed a false picture of society...The generation belonged to a period of transition from values already fixed to values that had to be created (Cowley, 1967, p.9)."

The bohemian's first search was for community. Many flocked to the post-war Village only to find that it had been overrun by Babbits affecting radical behavior. Rents shot skyward and impoverished artists could no longer afford to live there. Some drifted westward, but the most important members of the Lost Generation went to Paris. France not only offered freedom from Puritans and Prohibition, but it had a tradition of rebellion and artistic production which held out the hope of personal creativity and liberation. Alienation had bred an insatiable restlessness to move, to voyage to the land of Somewhere Else to recover in rarified form what the bohemians had been running away from. Many of the expatriate writers in Paris wrote fondly of the land they had left behind, as if only in exile could they discover what they had lost. The materialism of the nation had spawned expatriation, yet at the same time it had sparked a

spiritual patriotism that longed for the simplicity and beauty of America. The writers had discovered a promise buried beneath the tarnished veneer of money and morality.

The search for community was but the superficial covering of a deeper longing--the transformation of the personality. The self became the new focus of the lost generation's despair and utopian aspirations. The widespread belief that rationality and morality had corrupted the individual's sense of promise led the bohemians to explore the antitheses of conventional normality. They turned to a substantial body of literature which exalted the irrational in human behavior. During this period, Freud became popular. Although the young did not understand Freud completely, they took the word "repression" and waved it on their banners. America was bad because it repressed the self, they argued. If you want to be free, then you must release the repression that has been falsely imposed on you. The belief that society was repressed led to a loosening of moral standards among the young. There was a challenge to traditional ideas of good and evil. The two qualities of morality and immorality were paradoxically viewed as reflections of the same thing. Sexuality was regarded as a freedom that no longer needed to be protected by Victorian standards of propriety. The carefree lifestyle of the flapper became a model for libertarian female behavior. Feminism and equality of the sexes were accepted as corollaries to the new

sense of release from social repression.

The emphasis upon the irrational also led to a consciousness of primitivism and innocence. By questioning the premises of reason, the bohemians enshrined a skeptical attitude toward all certainties of science, religion and art. They were plunged into a chaos of dissolution where new values of primitivism emerged. Anarchy was celebrated; the whims of the private self became more important than the demands of society. The social and political world was viewed as an absurd drama that had little relevance for the sanctified ego. This attitude released primeval energies. Salvation by innocence became an accepted value. The child was raised as a metaphor of liberation; the artists and rebels argued that social pressures crush the child within us all and destroy inherent creativity. To return to a childlike vision and to irrational sensuous living for the moment was a means to regain the simplicity and pleasure of existence.

This emphasis upon nihilism, hedonism and the irrational gave a tenative anchor to the wild expressions of mood of the age and also gave artists a new set of working principles which resulted in a renaissance of high culture. But it was a bohemianism that was closely tied to the social and cultural milieu. Revolts against commercialism and conformity were tied to the general exhaustion of the post war period. Dialectical

opposition needs the tension of its enemy to sustain its idealism. But once the Depression broke, differences in life-styles began to melt into an all-embracing sense of loss. The gaiety and carelessness of the twenties disappeared. The rebels began to discard cultural ideals for political causes and class conformity. Economic security became uppermost and the old arguments against materialism seemed empty in those times of crisis. Like the prewar Village, the invasion of general social crisis broke the insulating bubble of cultural rebellion, shattering the exclusive bohemian community and replacing it with a community of national suffering.

The Beats

The Beat generation is the link between past forms of bohemianism and the counter culture. Spanning the period from roughly 1950-1961, the Beats translated the traditional values of cultural revolt, such as irrationality and hostility to the middle class, into more modern life-styles that were adopted by radicals during the 1960's. The Beats explored a new wilderness and the paths they opened were models for contemporary revolt.

The word "Beat" symbolized two contradictory ideas at once. Beat meant, on one hand, that its members were beaten, they h[illegible] been flattened, exhausted by a world that had used them and yet was indifferent to their ultimate fate. They were raw, hostile and ready for anything or anyone to salvage the wreck of civilization and self. But at the same time, beat also meant

"beatific." The rebels were in search of the ultimate vision that would transform the ugliness of the world into a beatific epiphany. They were as Lawrence Lipton called them, the Holy Barbarians, walking the wasteland of modern society with half-mad eyes, waiting for the ultimate revelation of God. These two extremes of the word "beat" point to the violent oscillations, almost schizoid in intensity, that formed the principles of the beat revolt. To create, it is often necessary to first destroy. The beats were determined to annihilate the self that society had corrupted and then re-create themselves in sanctification and through direct intuition of God and beauty.

The beats were triggered by intensive social forces that no longer appeared reasonable or useful. The atomic bomb stood at the core of their anti-theology, for it represented the ultimate insanity of civilization. The bomb threw the pallor of death and madness over every social gesture. The world was absurd; events and actions were no longer causally linked; society was a conglomerate of paradoxes and juxtapositions that only confused. In addition, the bomb had obliterated the certainty and promise of the future, for the beats believed that tomorrow might never appear. This uncertainty about the future drove the beats to an intensification of the moment. The present, the now, became the hedonistic center for action as the spectre of death hung over everything. So the beats lived fast, in a frantic rush to live and experience as much as possible before

it was too late.

The beats were also in touch with the classic underground hostility to commercialism and to the zombie-like Babbits that kept the system of materialism going. In the 1950's the organization man came into full flowering and quickly came to symbolize, for the beats, the mood of the decade. These were the years of the "Silent Generation" and the "Rat Race," which meant that you did your job for the organization, without complaining about your fate. McCarthyism had helped to button the lips of protest and materialism had buttoned the suits of the organization man. The beats believed that this excessive uniformity and intolerance had imprisoned the self and so the dialectics of liberation once more included release from convention. As Harrington notes, "Bohemia could not survive the passing of its polar opposite and precondition, middle-class morality. Free love and all-night drinking and art for art's sake were consequences of a single stern imperative: thou shalt not be bourgeois (Harrington, 1972, p. 99)," This rebellion was thus premised upon the inversion of middle-class values. The beats divided the world into the squares and the hip. The squares lived an orderly, organized and reasonable life. They had buried their fantasies, their Eros, beneath a layer of security and respectability. To be hip meant that the imagination was released from this subjugation of civilization. The beats lived their fantasies and voyaged

on the seas of the irrational and primitive. They celebrated euphoria and they broke down the membrane that separated the dream world from reality.

The search for beatitude and pleasure took them to worlds forbidden and taboo to normal society. Escape from the chaos of modernity was often found through drugs such as marijuana, peyote and heroin. Hallucination and time/space distortion became more than simply flight from social pressure. Drugs were a means to achieve ecstasy (meaning, literally, to go out of the body) and mystical visions. Like Thoreau, the beats wanted to change inner consciousness and perceptions and thereby transform the external world. Many of the beats studied anthropology and particularly the place of myth and ritual in society. Drugs and many other euphoriant acts were thus viewed as parts of a holy ritual designed to restore the sacred and mythic dimension to an increasingly banal and secularized world. To further release themselves from the grips of reason and social order the beats turned to the East. Many of their apartments were furnished in a poor imitation of Japanese decor. Artists turned to oriental painting and poetry to capture in simple detail and with burning intensity the beauty of the moment. Zen was also utilized as a mooring for a new system of logic and religion. Zen's emphasis upon innocence, experience and paradox fitted perfectly with the beat disposition to annihilate the imprisoning world view of the Western world.

In addition, the beats also identified themselves as outcasts and brothers with the downtrodden. They took on many of the qua'ities of the blacks' subculture, since both were oppressed by the dominant culture. By dress and appearance, the beats drew the same kind of rage and prejudice that the blacks had attracted by their color. Many of the beats took voluntary vows of poverty as a means to gain time for personal creativity and to demonstrate solidarity with the millions who had been denied material riches in America. The beats also adopted the black's jazz music as the language of their soul. Thus, the beats had willed themselves to the fringes of disorder. They were on the borders of the twilight zone where reason melted into chaos and privilege became oppression.

In a prophetic essay titled "The White Negro," Norman Mailer attempted to explain the existential implication of being hip. Mailer believed that, like the black, the beat was living on the margins of an increasingly totalitarian society which labeled such rebellions as psychotic. Thus the beats' alienation had incurred risks of oppression that former bohemians only had to deal with casually. Rebellion implied the risk of insanity, the possibility that the freedom which the beats stood for would be labeled as dangerous to the state and thus suppressed:

> ...there has been room already for the development of the antithetical psychopath who extrapolates from his own condition, from the inner certainty that his rebellion is just, a radical vision of the universe which thus separates him from the general ignorance, reactionary prejudice, and self-doubt of the more conventional psychopath. Having converted his unconscious experience into much conscious knowledge the hipster....is the sophistication of the wise primitive in a giant jungle, and so [its] appeal is beyond civilized man. (Mailer, p. 317)

> ...The strength of the psychopath is that he knows (where most of us can only guess) what is good for him and what is bad for him at exactly those instants when an old crippling habit has become so attacked by experience that the potentiality exists to change it, to replace a negative and empty fear with an outward action, even if--the fear is of himself, and the action is to murder. The psychopath murders--if he has the courage--out of the necessity to purge his violence, for if he cannot empty his hatred then he cannot love, his being is frozen with implacable self-hatred for his cowardice. (Mailer, p. 320)

It was the beats' voyage to these outer limits of sanity that broke the ground for the massive disaffiliation of the 1960's. In their willingness to abandon stability for the uncertainty of raw experience, the beats offered a path of liberation for the future. In their destruction of the limits of normality and morality, the beats had re-opened channels of possibility which society had increasingly repressed. They had pushed reason to its limits and in this chaos a new life-style had emerged.

It may appear that the beats, like their bohemian predecessors, were a deviant minority that had little relation to the problems

of society at large. Their rebellion and violation of social norms seemed to go against the American grain. They were so alienated and different from the mainstream that they invited hostility and mockery that distorted their essence. The beats, like later outcast groups, appeared hostile to the American Dream; in fact they appeared almost un-American and subversive. We would argue that the opposite is actually the case. The beats were devoted to the idea of America, they were earnestly attempting to restore the radical promise and freedom that were inherent in the American character. One analyst of the beat phenomenon wrote (Cook, 1971, p.152):

> Theirs was a sort of antimyth, one that turned the idea of America inside out. Instead of American cleanliness, the Beats offered dirt; for industry, sloth; and in place of the official, fundamentally Protestant American ethic, they presented their own, a morality with principles but no rules. This was how the Beats looked to the world at large. Accepting them it was possible to reject some aspects of American culture, and still retain affection for those qualities of the national character that have always been most appealing--informality, enthusiasm, openness to adventure, and a kind of bold, plain-spoken honesty.

Like other cultural and political radicals, the beats suggested that there was a higher loyalty, a spiritual patriotism that transcended the contemporary and embraced the vision of the past and the possibility of the future.

By the early 1960's, the beats were waning. The radical social activism of the civil rights' workers and the dawn of

campus radicalism had broken the conspiracy of silence that had permeated the 1950's. The beats were part of the spirits of their times, they were withdrawn euphorics who celebrated rebellion in an apolitical manner. The emergence in the 1960's of political protest meant that cultural revolt had been in part abandoned for the larger social questions and in the process the beats' style of indifference and apathy was no longer relevant to the contemporary mood. But by the middle and late 1960's, the beat life-style had re-emerged in altered form. Politics had begotten frustration and a sense of impotence. Radicalism for many people was diverted from the overtly political realm to the cultural realm. Now the beats' explorations of possibility were once again relevant. No longer the property of a small elite, the qualities of the beat rebellion were taken up by a mass movement, the counter culture (Harrington, 1972, p.103). The beats' quest for mysticism and madness, the ingestion of hallucinogens, the underground argot (Hippie comes from the beats' word hip) and the pervasive sense of despair and apocalypse became widely shared values of the counter culture. Bohemia, the tight community of madmen and artists, was dead. Yet in its place had emerged a culture that created on a mass society scale the principles of elite bohemianism with democratic accessibility.

CONCLUSION

In this essay, I have suggested that many themes and ideologies of rebellion have reappeared with consistency throughout American history and have stimulated many forms of social and political change. Rather than viewing the radicals as deviant or aberrant in national history, we should recognize that their dissatisfaction is an integral, though seldom dominant, part of the conscience and dynamics of the culture. It is this tension between the outsiders and the institutions of social control that has opened many pathways of social transformation and preserved the culture from within.

During the past decade, a new cycle of social unrest began. Beginning with the blacks' revolt for self-determination, the wave of rebellion spread to the youth and then was disseminated to diverse groups of the populace. Much like the Jacksonian period new sense of boundlessness and questioning of institutional norms took place, in which the values and authority of science, education, psychology and community were called into question. Analysis of the causes of this upheaval has been prolific and ranges from prophetic proclamations of a "new" culture to cynical declamations of unfulfilled Oedipal urges. In this confusion and amorphousness, we have often forgotten the ties that contemporary rebellion has with similar movements in the past. By extrapolating some characteristics from past cultural revolts to the present situation, we may be able to add some clarity to the contemporary malaise.

Radicals in this society have consistently stressed the distortion of basic ideals by the dominant social institutions. In the tension between institutional control and individual freedom, the friction of opposition begins. The radicals have argued that as this society has become more and more centralized and materialistic, the opportunity for creative self-growth, meaningful human fulfillment and toleration of human uniqueness has steadily declined. The rebellion against the normative pattern of these institutions has often taken the form of an inversion of those values that typify the culture of the majority. As the dissidents perceived a culture of great uniformity and commercialism, they turned away from it to celebrate a mystical self that was unique and uncontrolled by the decrees of conformity and materialism. While the dominant culture stressed a hard-nosed realism, repression of instinct and a rationally-grounded sensibility, the radicals celebrated an ostentatious deviation from these values. Bizarre life-styles, open eroticism, creative insanity and flux became positive values of rebellion. Stated simply, the greater the belief that the dominant institutions were coldly objective toward people, the greater the rebels' emphasis on subjectivity and the errant self.

These value clusters have remained with rebels today. Their hostility to the majority culture not only rejects materialism and conformity, but goes deeper. The majority culture represents a culture of death. It worships destruction. Beginning with the quintessential symbolism of the nuclear bomb, a small group of

leaders holds the key to the immortality of the society. Man, not the gods, holds the scales of life and death. Robert Jay Lifton states that it is no longer possible to imagine biological, theological or cultural posterity; "...we are faced with the prospect of being severed from virtually all of our symbolic paths of immortality (Lifton, 1971, p.24)." In this denial of transcendence and absorption with nihilism, the culture denies life.

The culture of death is not merely a nuclear abstraction, it is a daily facet of existence. Violence, whether on a massive military scale or on an urban street, becomes evermore accelerated in a perverse ritual of release and ecstasy. In more subtle ways, violence and sadistic manipulation permeate the institutions of society and the self-sufficient boundaries of the self are violated and often destroyed. The radicals argue that in the fields of education and psychiatry, for example, subtle methods of master-slave oppression and subjugation of the subjective self to "objective" labels are characteristic of the desire to deny differences in the name of social control. In the schools, the spontaneity and creative self-growth of the students are often suppressed and sublimated into a docile obedience to impersonal standards of performance. In psychology, disturbed patients' symptoms are often bent into a "sickness" which results in the denial of human and legal rights. The radicals believe that people are turned into manipulated objects, whose human qualities are subsumed to an all embracing "label" of the majority culture.

Creative difference or deviation is killed by excessive objectification. In such a culture of death and subtle psychic violence, the vitality of the individual is often destroyed--"'Man' can no longer be defined as what suits the dominant system, when the dominant system apparently does not suit men (Goodman, 1960, p.9)."

We have then a confrontation between eros and civilization. The radicals have revolted from a pervasive societal repression of creativity and pleasure that "normalizes" community into an objective monolith, employing subjugative standards as a means of manipulation. This rebellion has absorbed many of the symbolic phrases that have characterized earlier political forms of radicalism to suggest that contemporary institutions are not only undemocratic, but inhuman. Liberty, equality, and self-determination become key values in a conflict that crosses the neat fences between politics and culture. The protest to save the self thus focuses much of its rhetoric upon the undemocratic hierarchy of controls that denies equality and basic legal rights. In this revitalized vision of egalitarian man, the rebels in psychiatry, education and communitarianism have often detached themselves from the values of the dominant community to find in isolation and decentralization those principles of democracy that the larger society denies. Thus, salvation lies in the small group, whether it be free school or commune in the attempt to re-

create a democratic tolerance and an acceptance of individual differences.

The modern rites of democratic eros assume another important role. We have demonstrated that bohemians in this century have explored and celebrated the irrational side of human behavior. Overt rebellion from what are considered to be middle-class norms of repression and self denial, has resulted in styles of behavior which, by the standards of the controlling elites, would be labeled deviant or psychopathic. Yet, by the internal logic of the rebels in their sub-society, the advocacy of freakiness or chaotic behavioral styles possess an internal logical, albeit irrational, consistency. In the contemporary subculture of radicals, there is a similar acceptance of deviation from social norms. Given the widespread use of consciousness-altering drugs, the externally visible differences in dress and the hostility to many values of the culture of death, aberrant or freakish life styles have gained a positive value in the subculture. Being different expresses an affirmation of self, which the dominant culture often annihilates. By denying the norms of an oppressive culture's definitions of sanity, the radicals are seeking a condition of transcendence from the dominant society.

Because the contemporary rebellion is a mass movement that touches many levels of societal involvement, the affirmation of deviance and the questioning of the values of cultural sanity has begun to permeate many institutional structures. There is now a

widespread challenge of the traditional labels and techniques that have defined the scope of institutional structures. Many dissidents have begun to consider as irrational the behavior of institutions rather than the behavior of individuals. The viewpoint is reversed, and by an ironic twist of logic, in a mad society the deviant might be the most sane. In the social institutions' efforts to maintain equilibrium in the system, disorder often becomes irrationally categorized. As Herbert Marcuse has noted of this illogical categorization, "This language not only defines and condemns the Enemy, it also creates him; and this creation is not the Enemy as he really is but rather as he must be in order to perform his function for the Establishment (Marcuse, 1969, p. 74). If, as the radicals have argued, these definitions are the inventions of a culture dedicated to oppression and denial of instinct, then a widespread inversion takes place. The culture is itself irrational and the search for sanity and community must take place outside the controls of that culture.

At bottom, we suggest that the radical and his long history in this culture are a metaphor of the free individual. In their negation of social values and their search for the free self, they have supplied a symbolic affirmation for contemporary society. By breaking with the social norms, they have exiled themselves psychically and often geographically from the culture to find dimensions of self and community denied by the larger society.

REFERENCES

Anthony, E. Picking up the gun. New York: Dial Press, 1970.

Beard, C. An economic interpretation of the constitution of the United States. New York: Macmillan, 1941.

Becker, H. Outsiders. New York: Free Press, 1963.

Bernstein, B. (Ed.) Towards a new past. New York: Pantheon Books, 1968.

Bestor, A. Backwoods utopias. Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 1970.

Bourne, R. Youth and life. Freeport, New York: Books for Libraries Press, 1967.

Cantor, N. The age of protest. New York: Hawthorn Books, 1969.

Carmichael, S., & Hamilton, C. Black power. New York: Random House, 1967.

Commager, H. The American mind. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1959.

Cook, B. The beat generation. New York: Scribner and Sons, 1971.

Cowley, M. Exile's return. New York: Viking Press, 1967.

Curti, M. The roots of American loyalty. New York: Columbia University Press, 1946.

Destler, C. American radicalism: 1865-1901. New York: Octagon Books, 1963.

Elkins, S. Slavery: A problem in American institutional and intellectual life. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1959.

Emerson, R. W. The complete essays and other writings. New York: Modern Library, 1950.

Essien-Udom, E. Black nationalism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1962.

Gide, C. Communist and cooperative societies. London: G. G. Harrap and Company, 1930.

Goodman, P. Growing up absurd. New York: Vintage Books, 1960.

Greer, C. The great school legend. New York: Basic Books, 1972.

Harrington, M. We few, we happy few, we bohemians. Esquire, 1972, 78(2), 99-103, 162-164.

Hicks, J. The populist revolt. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1931.

Hinds, W. American communities and cooperative colonies. Chicago: C. H. Kerr, 1908.

Hoffman, F. The twenties. New York: Viking Press, 1955.

Hofstadter, R. The age of reform. New York: Vintage Books, 1955.

Holloway, M. Heavens on earth. New York: Library Publishers, 1951.

Kanter, R. Commitment and community. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press, 1972.

Lasch, C. The new radicalism in America 1889-1963. New York: Vintage Books, 1967.

Lawrence, D. H. Studies in classic American literature. New York: Viking Press, 1971.

Lens, S. Radicalism in America. New York: Thomas Y. Crowell Company, 1966.

Leuchtenberg,W. Franklin Delano Roosevelt and the New Deal. New York: Harper and Row, 1963.

Lifton, R. Boundaries: Psychological man in revolution. New York: Vintage Books, 1970.

Lipton, L. The holy barbarians. New York: Messner, 1959.

Lynd, S. Intellectual origins of American radicalism. New York: Vintage Books, 1969.

Mailer, N. Advertisements for myself. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1959.

Marcuse, H. An essay on liberation. Boston: Beacon Press, 1969.

Meyer, A. An educational history of the American people. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1957.

Meyers, M. The Jacksonian persuasion. New York: Vintage Books, 1957.

Moore, G. A special rage New York: Harper and Row, 1971.

Newfield, J. A prophetic minority. New York: New American Library, 1966.

Parry, A. Garrets and pretenders: A history of bohemianism in America. New York: Dover Publications, 1960.

Pollack, N. (Ed.) The Populist mind. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill, 1967.

Reich, C. The greening of America. New York: Bantam Books, 1970.

Roszak, T. The making of a counter culture. Garden City, New York: Doubleday Anchor Books, 1969.

Smith, H. Virgin land. New York: Vir ge Books, 1972.

Thoreau, H. D. Walden and other writings. New York: Modern Library, 1950.

Turner, F. The frontier in American history. New York: Henry Holt and Company, 1920.

Tyler, A. Freedom's ferment. New York: Harpers, 1962.

Wasserman, H. History of the United States. New York: Harper and Row, 1972.

Wehle, L. Hidden threads of history. New York: Macmillan, 1953.

Weinberg, A. (Ed.) The muckrakers. New York: Simon and Schuster, 1961.

Wiebe, R. The search for order. New York: Hill and Wang, 1967.